


**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**



In re: Equifax Inc. Customer
Data Security Breach Litigation

MDL Docket No 2800
No. 1:17-md-2800-TWT

CONSUMER ACTIONS

Chief Judge Thomas W. Thrash, Jr.

SUPPLEMENT TO RESPONSE re [1040] MOTION for Bond Pending Appeal

THE LAW AT THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT WAS BROKEN

District courts have an obligation to analyze objections carefully to ensure the settlement is fair to the absent class, and must provide a “reasoned response” to legitimate objections. *Cotton v. Hinton*, 559 F.2d 1326, 1331 (5th Cir. 1977) (“The Court should examine the settlement in light of the objections raised and set forth a reasoned response to the objections including findings of fact and conclusions of law necessary to support the response.”) followed in *Pettway v. Am. Cast Iron Pipe Co.*, 576 F.2d 1157, 1219 (5th Cir. 1978); *Burke v. Ruttenberg*, 317 F.3d 1261, 1263 (11th Cir. 2003). The district court abuses its discretion only “if it applies an incorrect legal standard, applies the law in an unreasonable or incorrect manner, follows improper procedures in making a determination or makes findings of fact that are clearly erroneous.” *Aycock v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 769 F. 3d 1063, 1068 a (11th Cir 2014) (quoting *Brown v. Ala Dep’t of Transportation.*, 597 F. 3rd 1160, 1173 (11th Cir 2010)).

The court should have known about the case law above that it was required to answer the objector’s objection and testimony. See Objection Doc 899 Exhibit B-10 pg 1-49 and Doc 913 for the meritorious issues that were ignored.

The failure to make any evaluation at all of the merits of this appellant's meritorious objection is clear error and abuse of discretion and absolutely will reverse this approval and proves a bond is not needed. The true costs for this appeal for the plaintiffs' are around \$1000.00 which the objector cannot afford either as Form 239 proves in the corrected in forma pauperis motion Doc 1015 proves without a doubt. He requests no bond or he will appeal this to the Eleventh.

I certify under penalty of perjury all of the above is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Respectfully Submitted,


A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher Andrews", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Christopher Andrews, Pro se objector P.O. Box 530394 Livonia, MI 48153-0394

T. 248-635-3810 E. caalooa@gmail.com Dated April 03, 2020

Certificate of Compliance

I hereby certify that this filing has been prepared in compliance with Local Rules 5.1 and 7.1 (if applicable.)



Christopher Andrews, Pro se objector P.O. Box 530394 Livonia, MI 48153-0394

T. 248-635-3810 E. caalooa@gmail.com Dated April 03, 2020

RULE 7.1(D) CERTIFICATE OF FONT COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the foregoing has been prepared with one of the font and point selections approved by the Court in Local Rule 5.1(C), Northern District of Georgia, specifically Times New Roman 14 point. (if applicable)



Christopher Andrews, Pro se objector P.O. Box 530394 Livonia, MI 48153-0394

T. 248-635-3810 E. caalooa@gmail.com Dated April 03, 2020

Certificate of Mailing

I certify that this document was sent to the Clerk of the Court via first class mail with copies sent to everyone else who are registered with CM/ECF.



Christopher Andrews, Pro se objector P.O. Box 530394 Livonia, MI 48153-0394 T.

248-635-3810 E. caalooa@gmail.com Dated April 03, 2020

THERE ARE TWO SEPARATE FILINGS ENCLOSED